

**PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT BOARD**  
**100 N Park**  
**Helena MT 59620**  
**Personnel Committee Meeting**  
**Tuesday February 13, 2007**  
**11:00 AM**

Committee Members: Elizabeth Nedrow Chair, N. Jay Klawon via phone  
and John Paull

Staff: Roxanne Minnehan, Melanie Symons, and Scott Miller

**Public Comment** – *No public comment.*

**Executive Director's Report**

The meeting was an organizational brainstorming meeting to discuss issues and determine management and the Board desires for the union contract negotiations. Management must meet with the union 90 days before the end of the contract – which will be the end of March.

**Negotiation Team (members include)**

Personnel Committee	Elizabeth Nedrow, Chair, Jay Klawon and John Paull
MPERA Management	Melanie Symons, Legal Counsel, Scott Miller, Legal Assistant and Roxanne Minnehan, Executive Director
MPERA Staff	Shell Pardis, Sheri Mitchell, and Kathy Herbel
DOA Staff	Kathleen Field, HR and Greg Martin, Labor Relations
MPEA Representative	Stacey Bird

State Pay Plan Bill increases. The state pay plan bill (HB 13) is proposing: a 3% increase in compensation each year of the biennium; that 0.6% of total salary for each position be distributed to employees for market progression, job performance, employee competencies etc each year of biennium; and an increase in the longevity increment for each employee who has completed 10 years of uninterrupted service with the state. A major consideration, should this bill pass, is how we would like to distribute the 0.6%

**Union Issues**

The union would like the 0.6% to be evenly distributed between all employees. In addition, the union also plans on bringing up the possibility of a comparison study between state and the civilian sector to study the “market salaries” and/or market progression. There was a third issue; however, the union had not brought it to light.

## **Committee Suggestions Concerns**

Roxanne Minnehan presented the following management concerns with the current contract:

1. Market progression – this is tied to the number of years of service in a particular position. The issue with this is if a person moves to another position within the office, the person does not receive credit in terms of market salary for years of service in the previous position. This could prevent people from applying for other positions within the office, which could allow for stagnation of an individual.
2. When a new position opens, it is a requirement to post the position in-house for five working days. There are some positions that this is completely unnecessary because there are no qualified applicants in-house or the position is entry level. Thus, this delays the hiring process. Management would like discretion to waive the five day in-house limit on these types of cases.
3. We have several positions in the office that developed into supervisory positions. It was our understanding that supervisory positions were not in the union. We were told that these positions would remain in the unions; however though attrition, new hires would not be in the union. We need a written agreement with the Union that supervisory positions are not in the union.

Other issues raised were if we agreed to the “even distribution” of pay increases, how do you compensate your high achievers? Is there a possibility of some sort of incentive pay? It was suggested that we meet with the Union to discuss these issues.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting was adjourned at 12:00 pm. Roxanne Minnehan will contact the Union to schedule a meeting. After the union meeting, a Personnel Committee Meeting will be scheduled.